

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17 have been amended. New claim 20 has been added. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

Applicants have timely filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) along with this Amendment, including the filing fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of any Office action and enter this Amendment for consideration under 37 CFR 1.114.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-17, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,164) in view of Calvert et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0102989) and further in view of O'Neil (U.S. Patent No. 6,778,818).

Murphy does not discuss or suggest:

a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object;

and

wherein the position of the search object is calculated by solving an equation of circles, each circle having a radius equal to a distance between one of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of calculates *only* a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object. Furthermore, the position of the search object is calculated by solving an *equation of circles* in which each circle has a radius equal to the calculated distances between each of a plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object. Since the position of the search object is calculated through such an equation of circles, only distance information between each of the measuring apparatuses and the search object is needed, thereby speeding up the time that is required for locating the search object. The Examiner states that Murphy discloses a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object. However, it is submitted that this is incorrect. Murphy, as relied on by the Examiner, discloses that a tracking unit of a position determining device determines the direction, bearing, and/or velocity of a search object, as well as the range of the search object (Murphy, col. 4, lines 55-60; col. 6, lines 48-50). As such, Murphy does not

calculate only a distance between the position determining device and the search object, but several other variables as well. As a result, Murphy is not capable of calculating the position of a search object using an equation of circles in a shortened period of time, as is accomplished by the invention of claim 1. Furthermore, Calvert et al. and O'Neil are silent on these features of the invention of claim 1.

Since none of Murphy, Calvert et al., or O'Neil discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2-3 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

None of Murphy, Calvert et al., or O'Neil discuss or suggest:

calculating only a distance between each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object from the response received;

and

wherein the position of the search object is calculated by solving an equation of circles, each circle having a radius equal to a distance between one of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object,

as recited in amended claims 8 and 14, so that claims 8 and 14 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

as recited in amended claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17. Therefore, claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 15 depend directly from amended independent claims 8 and 14, respectively, and include all the features of claims 8 and 14, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 9 and 15 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

None of Murphy, Calvert et al., or O'Neil discuss or suggest:

wherein each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses is mobile and calculates only a distance between each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object, and the plurality of measuring apparatuses located around the search object cooperate with the service device, and

wherein the position information of the search object is calculated by solving an equation of circles, each circle having a radius equal to a distance between one of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object,

as recited in amended claims 4-5, 10-11, and 16-17. Therefore, claims 4-5, 10-11, and 16-17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 5, 11, and 17, respectively, and include all the features of claims 5, 11, and 17, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 6-7, 12-13, and 18-19 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

II. New Claim

New claim 20 has been added. None of the prior art cited by the Examiner discusses or suggests:

a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object;

and

wherein the position of the search object is calculated by solving an equation of circles, each circle having a radius equal to a distance between one of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object,

as recited in new claim 20. Therefore, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art. Thus, it is submitted that claim 20 is in a condition suitable for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/784,182

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5-3-07

By: 
Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501